

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this Application. Reconsideration and further examination of the subject patent application in light of the present Amendment and Remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Pat. Publ. No. US 2005/0154598 to Kanayama et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,012,523 to Stuart. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

In response, independent claim 1 has been clarified by being further directed to the context “wherein an alarm event detected by a security sensor of the security system causes the security sensor to immediately activate the security system cameras by transmitting an RF security/alarm event initiating message to the security system cameras which causes the security system video cameras to awaken from the standby inactive video mode into the active video recording mode and collect pre-alarm video and wherein the initiating message is also received by the security system control panel for processing.” Independent claim 11 has been similarly clarified. The immediate activation of the video cameras by the sensors for pre-alarm recording of video is discussed in paragraph [0007] of the specification. The receipt of an initiating message from a sensor 22 by the control panel 28 and subsequent processing of the alarm is discussed in paragraph [0016] of the specification.

Claims 1-20 are now clearly differentiated over Kanayama et al. and Stuart. For example, Kanayama et al. is merely directed to a “trespasser sensor 12b ... activated around the clock; upon detection of an abnormality, it sends a detection signal to the sensor control station 21 to request that the security camera 12a start operating” (Kanayama et al., par. [0104]). Similarly Stuart is merely directed to camera on a peephole of an entrance door. The Stuart camera may be activated by a doorbell signal to, in turn, place a call to a homeowner.

As such, neither Kanayama et al. or Stuart or the combination of Kanayama et al. and Stuart provide any teaching or suggestion of the context “wherein an alarm event detected by a security sensor of the security system causes the security sensor to immediately activate the security system cameras by transmitting an RF security/alarm event initiating message to the security system cameras which causes the security system video cameras to awaken from the standby inactive video mode into the active video recording mode and collect pre-alarm video and wherein the initiating message is also received by the security system control panel for processing.” Moreover, this difference is functional because it allows the recording of an intruder even where a central control panel has been compromised by the intruder or by a power failure.

Since the combination fails to teach or suggest this feature, the combination fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Since the combination fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation, the rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/733,727
Amendment under Rule 37 CFR § 1.113

Closing Remarks

For the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that the subject application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicits an early Notice of Allowance. Should the Primary Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, the Primary Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the below-listed number.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee which may be required for this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.18, including but not limited to the issue fee, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-0920. Should no proper amount be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 23-0920. *(If filed by paper, a duplicate copy of this sheet(s) is enclosed).*

Respectfully submitted,
HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS
WELSH & KATZ

By: _____

Jon P. Christensen
Registration No. 34,137

Paul M. Vargo
Registration No. 29,116

Dated: April 14, 2010
HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS
WELSH & KATZ
120 South Riverside Plaza, Suite 2200
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 655-1500